



ITY DOCKET 10003884-1  
1753

I certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D. C. 20231

Date of Deposit: 30 May 2003

*David Romney*  
David S. Romney

RECEIVED  
JUN 10 2003  
TC 1700

#  
4/w.m.  
6/12/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No: 09/829,500

Confirmation No. 6732

Filing Date: 9 April 2001

Examiner: Mutschler, Brian L.

Inventors: Gates, et al.

Group Art: 1753

Title: RE-USABLE MANDREL FOR FABRICATION OF INK-JET ORIFICE PLATES

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated 30 April 2003 which provides for a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121, applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for the reasons stated below. In the event the Examiner's restriction is maintained, applicants elect claims 15, 17 and 18 of Group II drawn to a mandrel, without prejudice to proceeding with the non-elected claims in continuation or divisional applications.

A careful review of the claims of Group II indicate the illogical basis for the Examiner's grouping of claims. While it is true that claims 1-7 are drawn to a process for fabricating a mandrel without limitation as to the type of mandrel, all of the remaining claims make express reference (directly or by reference to an incorporated claim) to an inkjet printhead mandrel! Claims 17-18 cover "An ink-jet printhead mandrel . . ."; claim 16 covers an ink-jet printhead fabricated on the ink-jet mandrel of claim 15; claim 15 covers an inkjet mandrel made in

accordance with the process of claim 8; and claim 8 (and its dependent claims 9-14) covers a process for fabricating an ink-jet printhead mandrel "wherein said third features define shape, location and geometry of features of an ink-jet printhead to be electroformed using said mandrel".

So it is submitted that an examination of all claims 8-18 will require substantially overlapping searches in the ink-jet printing field for structural features, fabrication methods and ink-jet printhead features based on applicants' unique ink-jet printhead mandrel. It is believed that dividing up these claims is not authorized or necessary.

Under the circumstances applicants are willing to accept a restriction and withdrawal of claims 1-7 as covering a possible distinct invention, but earnestly request reconsideration so that the closely inter-related claims 8-18 can be examined together as covering different related aspects of a specifically recited ink-jet printhead mandrel and printheads made therefrom.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Romney  
Registration No. 24,266  
Attorney for Applicants  
Telephone: (801) 478-0071

Dated: 30 May 2003